



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,089	08/26/2003	Samuel H. Gellman	09820.286	2777
25005	7590	01/10/2005	EXAMINER	
DEWITT ROSS & STEVENS S.C. 8000 EXCELSIOR DR SUITE 401 MADISON, WI 53717-1914			KOSAR, ANDREW D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N . 10/648,089	Applicant(s) GELLMAN ET AL.	
	Examin r Andrew D Kosar	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14 are pending and require restriction.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10 and 12-14, drawn to isolated, unnatural polypeptides of the formula $A-[X_a-Y-Z_c]_d-A'$, wherein an exemplary embodiment is classified in class 530, subclass 332.
- II. Claim 11, drawn to a method of probing, disrupting, or mimicking binding interactions between two proteins, wherein an exemplary embodiment is classified in class 436, subclass 501.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, one could practice the method, a method to 'probe the binding interactions between two protein molecules' via a materially different product. As the claim currently recites, it reads upon Western Blot analysis of protein-protein interaction over time. Akt phosphorylation of GSK-3 α can be followed by detection with anti-GSK-3 α antibody over time in a Western Blot assay. Further, the effect of kinase domain inhibitors or plekstrin homology domain inhibitors may be studied for their effect on the interaction between GSK-3 α and Akt.

The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the non-patented literature search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group, such as the structure of a single unnatural polypeptide, would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group, such as the method of screening the effects of said polypeptide, or the structure of another distinct polypeptide, or the effects of a distinctly different polypeptide in protein-protein interactions.

Additionally, the compounds of the instant application are distinct, absent evidence to the contrary, and would require a unique search strategy. The search for the distinct compounds is conducted based on their chemical structure. Therefore, the search of one chemical structure would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another structure, nor would it necessarily lead to the discovery of methods of using and/or making.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search for one invention would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another invention, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper, and to not restrict would be an undue burden on the Examiner.

Election of Peptide

Claims 1-14 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising unnatural polypeptide. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed peptide, even though this requirement is traversed.

Art Unit: 1654

The claims are broadly drawn to compounds of the general formula $A-[X_a-Y-Z_c]_d-A'$, wherein each variable component may be of a myriad of possible moieties, or bonds. In order to effect a complete response, Applicant is first required to identify the genus of each moiety (i.e.- X is β -amino, Z is α -amino, etc.) and identify specifically an integer for each a, c, and d. Further, Applicant is required to elect a single peptide from said genus, wherein each moiety is specifically and clearly identified, such that a complete structure is formulated [Note: A generic (i.e.- γ -constrained amino acid, carboxy-terminus protecting group, etc.) may NOT be elected as a moiety of the elected invention because no meaningful search can be conducted without an undue burden, due to the myriad of potential permutations and variables possible for each compound]. For example, Applicant may elect as the peptide Octamer 37 (AH-III-81, page 100) of the formula $Ac-(ACPC-K-ACPC-Y)_2-NH_2$; which is interpreted by the Examiner to be of the genus $(\gamma\text{-amino-}\alpha\text{-amino-}\gamma\text{-amino-}\alpha\text{-amino})_2$; such that in the general formula $A-[X_a-Y-Z_c]_d-A'$: Y is 'a bond', a, c, and d are each 2, A is Ac, A' is NH_2 , X^1 is γ -amino (ACPC), X^2 is α -amino (K), Z^1 is γ -amino (ACPC), Z^2 is α -amino (Y).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Rejoinder Practice

The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Inventorship

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

NO CLAIMS ARE ALLOWED.

Art Unit: 1654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew D. Kosar whose telephone number is (571)272-0913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8am-430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campbell can be reached on (571)272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Andrew D. Kosar, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1654



BRUCE R. CAMPBELL, PH.D
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600